

## **REMARKS**

In the subject office action, the Examiner objected to the presence of "hyperlinks and/or other form of browser executable code" in the specification. In response, Applicant reviewed the specification, but found no such presence. If the Examiner is referring to the phrase "MapQuest™.com, Inc. of New York, NY" on line 21 of page 13, Applicant respectfully submits that the phrase is not a hyperlink, nor browser executable code. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdraw of the objection, or specifically identifies for the Applicant what the Examiner is objecting to.

The Examiner also objected to an informality in claim 23. Applicant believes the Examiner meant to object to claim 22 instead, as that is where the informality exists. Claim 22 has been amended accordingly, overcoming the Examiner's objections.

The amendment is being entered to overcome an informality. The amendment is not being entered to overcome any prior art.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10-12, 14 and 22 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Chou (USP 6,327,533).

In response, Applicant submits herewith a declaration of the inventor and supporting evidence in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.131, declaring under the penalty of perjury and supporting that Applicant has conceived the invention prior to June 30, 2000, the effective date of Chou, and acted diligently thereafter, leading to the filing of the subject application on Oct 16, 2000.

More specifically, Applicant is submitting herewith

a) a declaration by the inventor declaring under the penalty of perjury that he has conceived the invention before the effective date of Chou, Jun 30, 2000,

b) a Memo-to-File dated March 8, 2000, summarizing the inventions the inventor disclosed to the inventor's attorney in a meeting that day, including the invention of the present application, identified as items 9, 10 and 12 in the memo;

c) a declaration by the attorney at the meeting on March 8, 2000, declaring under the penalty of perjury that all matters claimed in pending claims 1-30 were disclosed to the attorney during the meeting; and

d) an annotated version of the March 8, 2000 memo, updated with the application/patent numbers and the filing dates of the various inventions disclosed in the meeting, showing Applicant's diligence in working with Applicant's attorney in getting the multitude of applications timely filed.

Accordingly, Applicant submits Applicant has satisfied the burden in demonstrating that Applicant has conceived the invention prior to the effective date of Chou, Jun 30, 2000, and has been diligent leading the filing of the Application on Oct 16, 2000. Thus, Chou is not an eligible prior art reference.

Claims 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Chou and Barker (USP 6,542,075). Since, Chou is ineligible prior art. Barker may not be combined with Chou. Therefore, claims 5 and 8 are patentable.

Claims 15-21 and 23-30 were rejected for the same reason as claims 1-14. Accordingly, for at least the same reason, claims 15-21 and 23-30 are patentable.

Thus, claims 1-30 are in condition of allowance. Early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No.  
500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Applicant

Date: February 13, 2004



---

by, Aloysius AuYeung, Reg. No. 35,432  
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.  
Attorney for Applicant

Pacwest Center  
1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste 1600-1900  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Phone: (503) 222-9981,  
FAX: (503) 796-2900